

**REMARKS**

The final Office Action mailed February 22, 2008 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13, 14 and 16-20 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13, 14, and 16 stand rejected. Claims 5 and 21 stand objected to. Claims 17-21 have been cancelled to place the application in condition for allowance.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's indication that Claims 5 and 21 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By the above amendment, independent Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of original dependent Claim 21. Independent Claim 7 has been similarly amended. Claim 21 has been canceled accordingly.

The objection to the specification is respectfully traversed. Applicants have amended the specification at page 4, line 23 and at page 5, line 7 to replace the term "hub 18" with the term "hub 14." Further, Applicants have removed the blank space at page 5, line 16. For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 7-11, 13, 14, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 has been amended to delete the phrase "a portion of said corresponding rib contacting a surface defining said groove." Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 7 satisfies the requirements of Section 112 and, accordingly, request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 8-11, 13, 14, and 16 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 7. When the recitations of Claims 8-11, 13, 14, and 16 are considered in combination with the

recitations of Claim 7, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 8-11, 13, 14, and 16 likewise satisfy the requirements of Section 112.

In view of the above amendment, Applicants submit that Claims 7-11, 13, 14, and 16 are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is solicited.

The rejection of Claims 1-4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 1,861,640 to McCabe (hereinafter referred to as “McCabe”) is respectfully traversed.

McCabe describes a clothes washing machine of the “gyrator” type. The machine includes an upright casing with a vertical shaft journaled in a hollow sleeve that is tightly joined to the bottom of the tub. The upright casing is connected at its lower end to a switch oscillating mechanism and at its upper end to a removable dasher. The dasher includes a circular disk provided with one or more vanes or blades on its upper face and having a central socket for the reception of the head of the shaft. The head is formed with longitudinal driving ribs which are narrowest at the upper ends and flare circumferentially along a length of the head. The socket is formed with complementary ribs that have lateral edge-faces which engage the edge faces of the first ribs.

Claim 1 recites a hub assembly for a washing machine transmission including “a brake hub defining an opening therethrough, a plurality of ribs extending radially inward from an interior surface of said brake hub; an isolator insert comprising a plurality of legs, said isolator insert positioned at least partially within said brake hub opening, each leg of said plurality of legs configured to extend through said opening and between adjacent ribs of said plurality of ribs with said isolator insert inserted into said brake hub; and an input shaft defining a plurality of grooves within an exterior surface of said input shaft, each groove of said plurality of grooves configured to receive a corresponding rib of said plurality of grooves.”

McCabe does not describe or suggest a hub assembly as recited in Claim 1. More specifically, McCabe does not describe or suggest a hub assembly including an input shaft

defining a plurality of grooves within an exterior surface of the input shaft, wherein each groove of the plurality of grooves is configured to receive a corresponding rib of the plurality of ribs. Rather, in contrast to the present invention, McCabe merely describes a clothes washing machine that includes a shaft having a head that is formed with longitudinal first ribs, and a socket formed with complementary ribs that engage the edge faces of the first ribs.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over McCabe.

Claims 2-4 and 6 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 2-4 and 6 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 2-4 and 6 likewise are patentable over McCabe.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 102 rejection of Claims 1-4 and 6 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 1-4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 2,218,275 to Woodin (hereinafter referred to as “Woodin”) is respectfully traversed.

Woodin describes a splined torque drive for a washing machine agitator. A drive shaft generally extends through the base or bottom of a washing machine tub and is adapted to drive an agitator. The upper end of the drive shaft is keyed to a male torque block by a pin or fastening key. This torque member is provided with splines or ribs and channels therebetween adapted to inter-engage or interlock the splines and channels of a complementary female member suitably connected to the upper end of a high center post of the agitator.

Claim 1 recites a hub assembly for a washing machine transmission including “a brake hub defining an opening therethrough, a plurality of ribs extending radially inward from an interior surface of said brake hub; an isolator insert comprising a plurality of legs, said isolator insert positioned at least partially within said brake hub opening, each leg of said

plurality of legs configured to extend through said opening and between adjacent ribs of said plurality of ribs with said isolator insert inserted into said brake hub; and an input shaft defining a plurality of grooves within an exterior surface of said input shaft, each groove of said plurality of grooves configured to receive a corresponding rib of said plurality of grooves.”

Woodin does not describe or suggest a hub assembly as recited in Claim 1. More specifically, Woodin does not describe or suggest a hub assembly including an input shaft defining a plurality of grooves within an exterior surface of the input shaft, wherein each groove of the plurality of grooves is configured to receive a corresponding rib of the plurality of ribs. Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Woodin merely describes a torque drive member that includes splines and channels therebetween that are adapted to inter-engage the splines and channels of a complementary female member.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Woodin.

Claims 2-4 and 6 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 2-4 and 6 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 2-4 and 6 likewise are patentable over Woodin.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 102 rejection of Claims 1-4 and 6 be withdrawn.

PATENT

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric T. Krischke

Registration No.: 42,769

ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP

One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600

St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740

(314) 621-5070